DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 157 116 CS 502 169

AUTHOR Atwood, L. Erwin; Jarvis, Dennis
TITLE Political Attitudes, Political Activity, and Communication: A Typal Analysis.
PUB DATE Apr 78
NOTE 40p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the International Communication Association (Chicago, Illinois, April 25-29, 1978)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Information Needs; *Media Research; Political Affiliation; *Political Attitudes; *Political Influences; *Public Opinion
IDENTIFIERS *Communication Research

ABSTRACT

Persuasive mass communication is believed to be more likely to reinforce existing opinions than to change them. This study set out to test this hypothesis in the political area by doing the following: isolating attitudinal patterns in a sample of voters; determining if characteristics of the questionnaire statements were systematically related to acceptance or rejection of the statements; and testing the ability of other communication and political variables to discriminate among the attitude types. Q-analysis of the responses of 245 registered voters to 53 opinion statements yielded five basic patterns of response. Four of the five patterns were characterized by either systematic agreement or systematic disagreement with at least one of the five opinion dimensions the statements were designed to represent. One of the five patterns focused on national and state election issues; three focused on rejection of dimensions not normally considered election issues; and one attitude pattern could not be described in terms of the five dimensions. Results also indicate that a minority of the subjects (19%) are "issue voters," and that traditional issues (war, crime, welfare, taxes, and cost of living) do not function as issues for the majority of voters. (References and tabular data are included.) (Author/DF)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED157116

POLITICAL ATTITUDES, POLITICAL ACTIVITY, AND COMMUNICATION: A TYPAL ANALYSIS

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

L. Erwin Atwood

Dennis Jarvis

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

By: L. Erwin Atwood
Professor
Mass Communication
Research Center
School of Journalism
Southern Illinois University
Carbondale, Illinois

and

Dennis Jarvis
Research Department
Marsteller Inc.
866 Third Avenue
New York, New York

Presented to the Political Communication Division at the International Communication Association's Annual Conference, April 25-29, 1978, Chicago, Illinois.

C 5582 169

Political Attitudes, Political Activity, and Communication:
A Typal Analysis

In 1960 Klapper discussed at length the concepts of selective exposure, selective perception, and selective retention as prime factors in political communication and behavior. A great deal of what Klapper contends is based upon the classic studies of Lazarsfeld, Berelson, and McPhee (1954). Briefly, these studies provided evidence of a reinforcement effect with respect to mass communication and voting behavior rather than a conversion effect. According to Klapper,

> Research has pretty well established that such mass communication (persuasive) is more likely to reinforce existing opinions than to change them, and more likely to produce modifications than conversions. (p. 18)

The selectivity processes are affected by sociological factors, personality factors, attitudes, and other variables.

Sherrod (1972) examined the selective perception concept with respect to the perception of political candidates. The study found support for the hypothesis "that selective perception of candidates' positions is a means of resolving inconsistent political attitudes" (p. 555) by employing an A-B-X balance model.

McCombs (1968) contends that in order to understand the role of mass communication in politics ". . . more specific knowledge must be acquired about the individual's cognitive representations of politics" (p. 34). McCombs, therefore, argues in favor of using the selective processes as a means of understanding political communication and political behavior.

The role of political attitudes was examined by Dustin (1965) in order to determine the relationship between authoritarianism and pre-election candidate preferences and to find out the way such preferences changed after an election. Dustin concluded ". . . that the relationship between F (authoritarianism) and political preferences may be conditioned by political awareness and that there is a tendency to become less extreme in one's political preference after an election" (p. 1212).

Kerpelman (1968), in a study similar to Dustin (1965), examined the relationship of political behavior in the 1964 U.S. Presidential election to personality (authoritarianism-equalitarianism)

and an attitude dimension (autocratic-democratic). The results indicated a relationship between voting conservatively and authoritarianism-autocracy. Those subjects who showed a preference for Senator Barry Goldwater, the conservative, Republican candidate in the 1964 election, demonstrated more authoritarianism in their personality and more autocracy in their attitudes.

Other research regarding political attitudes and communication and political behavior lends support for the further examination of the area. For example, Jahoda (1954) found that political attitudes are related to the way people judge politicians. Also, Becker and Preston (1969) found a relationship between media usage, political activity, and psychological political efficacy.

In the study reported here we attempt to explore the nature of attitude patterns for empirically derived belief groups (types) among a sample of voters and then relate communication variables, political activity, and reported voting behavior to the different attitudinal groups. Most political communication research has utilized either qualitative, a priori, typologies based either in social theory or on traditional demographic variables. Nimmo and Savage (1976) have provided a refreshing departure from the traditional model, and in the analysis here we will extend the use of typal analysis (Q-analysis) to differentiate among types through multiple discriminant analysis.

One of the major problems of Q-analysis for some investigators has been the apparent subjective nature of the interpretations of the characteristics of the individuals who cluster into factors (hypothetical persons) and the hierarchies of behaviors, statements, or other observations used to describe the response patterns. For the most part, the interpretations have been made within the factor analytic model which leads, at least in appearances, to a circular description or explanation of the findings. That is, the collection of variables is factored to reduce it to a subset, the smaller collection of factors, which is then "explained" in terms of some semantic interpretations based on the characteristics of the original set of variables. The problems and questions that can be raised are only too obvious. Yet as McKinney (1969) has noted:

> The construction of classes, categories, or types is a necessary aspect of the process of inquiry by means of which we reduce the complex to the simple, the unique to the general, and the occurrent to the recurrent. (p. 3)

In an attempt to overcome some of the limitations of traditional

typological analysis we will explore the hierarchies of responses through regression techniques and attempt to discriminate among the clusters of voters (the types or hypothetical people) on the basis of their communication behavior, reported voting variables, and other political activity not included in the initial factor analysis. The rationale and procedures for these analyses have been described by Atwood (1970).

Given a diverse but systematic set of statements with which individuals can agree or disagree, we would expect to find, in the population of voters, groups with different degrees of coherence in the ways in which they order the statements. Those respondents with clear political beliefs about parties, campaign issues, or basic political philosophy might be expected to produce an overall response pattern that would reflect systematic acceptance of certain items, say some campaign issues, possible systematic rejection of other kinds of issues, and indifference to other items.

We might further expect to find groups (types) that show no systematic ordering of the statements. These patterns would be defined primarily in terms of those idiosyncratic items that seemed important to the individual at the time he/she was responding to the statements. However, we must recognize that if the responses are truely idiosyncratic it is unlikely that clusters of respondents will be isolated by the factor analysis. Idiosyncratic in the sense we intend it here largely reflects our inability to interpret what the respondents have done in the context of what we have planned.

Given these considerations, we would expect to find both the systematic and unsystematic patterns of responses among the sample of registered voters. Clearly, we would expect to find different issues appealing to different typologies -- for if the behavior was similar for all respondents there would be only one typology emerging from the analysis. While this is possible, we are inclined to doubt that it will occur.

Once patterns of response are identified and the systematic component is described, the subsequent question is one of "what else can we say about the type?" To do this additional describing we must introduce variables not included in the Q-analysis in the manner described below.

Method

Data analyses were secondary analyses of survey data collected through personal interviews with registered voters in three Southern Illinois counties during the two week period immediately prior to the 1972 general election. Seventy-seven of the respondents had participated in a similar study of the 1972 Illinois primary election and had been chosen at random from voter affadavits filed at the time they received their ballots to vote in the primary. The remainder of the 245 respondents were chosen at random from current registered voter lists in the three counties.

Respondents sorted 53 statements regarding attitudes toward (1) political efficacy, (2) ego centrism, (3) universities and university students, (4) major national issues, and (5) major state issues. The sorting procedure required the respondent to place the statements into modified 5-point Likert-type categories (strongly agree, agree, neutral, disagree, strongly disagree). The 53 statements became the variables in the factor analysis. The factor analysis was a principal axis solution with iteration to communalities beginning with squared multiple correlations as communality estimates. The rotation was to oblique (oblimax) reference structure. Following the Q-analysis the raw data matrix for all respondents was transposed, normalized, and correlations were computed between each of the derived response patterns and each respondent. The procedure was essentially as described by MacLean, Danbury, and McNelly (1965). Respondents were assigned to the type on which they had their highest significant, positive correlation.

In order to describe the response patterns, the statements were assigned to a set of dummy vectors representing the five dimensions noted above. The pattern of z-scores (showing each types' association with each of the 53 items) were then regressed on the dummy vectors to determine if the types had systematically agreed or disagreed with any of the five dimensions.

Once the respondents had been "typed" five stepwise multiple discriminant analyses were generated in an attempt to examine potential differences among the types. The models were designed to examine the relationships between the Q-types and political communication, voting behavior, and other political activity. The five discriminant models were identified by the political communications variables included. The first model examined the relationship between the types and the amount of information respondents' reported receiving from a variety of media and interpersonal sources. The second model

attempted to discriminate among the types on the basis of the kind of campaign information the respondents reported receiving. The third model attempted to discriminate on perceived believability of the media and interpersonal sources. The fourth model assessed the perceived influence of communication sources. The fifth, and final model, assessed the perceived usefulness of sources for seeking political information. Political communication variables were measured by modified 5-point Likert-type scales.

Political activity in each model was defined by the respondent's reported (1) wearing campaign buttons or displaying political bumper stickers; (2) attendance at political meetings, rallies, or dinners; (3) trying to talk someone into voting a certain way; (4) contributions of money to a candidate or party; (5) working for a party or candidate; (6) voting for the same party over time; (7) party identification -- Republican, Democrat, or Independent (assigned values of 1, 2, and 3, respectively); (8) strength of party identification (on a 7-point quasi-continuum).[1] Anticipated voting behavior was defined by respondents' report of intention to vote for (1) President (Richard Nixon, Republican; George McGovern, Democrat), (2) U.S. Senator (Charles Percy, Republican; Roman Pucinski, Democrat), (3) Governor (Richard Ogilvie, Republican; Daniel Walker, Democrat), (4) U.S. Congressman (Kenneth Gray, Democrat; Hugh Muldoon, Independent), (5) Secretary of State (Edmund Kucharski, Republican; Michael Howlett, Democrat), (6) State Comptroller (George Lindberg, Republican; Dean Barringer, Democrat), and (7) State Senator (Gale Williams, Republican; Kenneth Buzbee, Democrat).[2]

The multiple discriminant analyses were stepwise models which minimized Wilks lambda (Klecka, 1975, pp. 434-467). Four functions were derived for each analysis. For each significant function the discriminant coefficients were examined to determine which variables were contributing to the function and whether the contribution was positive or negative.

The primary objectives of this study are to (1) isolate attitudinal patterns among a sample of voters, (2) determine if characteristics of the statements used are systematically related to acceptance or rejection of the statements, and (3) test the ability of other communication and political variables to discriminate among the attitude types.

Findings

Q-Analysis

The Q-analysis identified five basic patterns of responses accounting for 51 per cent of the total variance. To indicate each type's association with the statements, standard scores were computed for each type on each item (Table 1). The criterion for a meaningful difference between types is a z-score difference of ± 1.0 or more. Where there is no difference as great as 1.0 across all types, the statements are considered consensus items. Positive scores indicate agreement with the statement. The correlations between types are given in Table 2. Only the correlations between Type V and Types I and II are not statistically significant at the .05 level. Although significant, these correlations are modest, and the highlights of these associations among types are described in the section on Consensus.

When the respondents not included in the factor analysis were assigned to one of the five types, two subjects were dropped for lack of significant positive associations with any of the types. Seven respondents were dropped from further analysis due to missing data. The final N was 236.

Consensus

There were eight consensus items, none of which were statements with which the respondents disagreed, and the strength of agreement with the items is only moderate (z-score less than ± 1.0). The consensus items are:

31. Poverty and welfare problems are important considerations in deciding my vote for State Senator. (z=0.73)

32. The drug abuse problem is an important consideration in deciding my vote for State Senator. (z=0.72)

44. Corruption in government is an important consideration in deciding my vote for President. (z=0.66)

13. Poverty and welfare problems are important considerations in deciding my vote for Governor. (z=0.66)

42. Taxes are an important issue in deciding my vote for President. (z=0.54)

8. The high cost of living is an important issue in deciding my vote for State Senator. (z=0.41)

4. The high cost of living is an important consideration in deciding my vote for Governor. (z=0.34)

26. Crime and lawlessness in society are important considerations in deciding my vote for Governor. (z=0.11)

These consensus items focus on national and state election issues and do not refer to matters of political efficacy, ego centrism, or problems of universities and university students.

Type I (N = 29)

Type I's response pattern is characterized by rejection of statements about the universities. The university vector accounts for 15 per cent of the variance in Type I's z-score pattern; the zero-order correlation between the university vector and the z-score pattern was -0.39 ($p < .05$).

To a greater extent than all other types, Type I agrees with this statement:

23. I'm the kind of person who lives more from day to day rather than planning my life ahead all the time. (z=2.1)

And, to a greater extent than all others, Type I disagrees with these statements:

11. Taxes are an important issue in deciding my vote for state senator. (z= -0.6)

39. University students would be justified in holding peaceful protest rallies on campus in order to bring about change at the university which they attend. (z= -1.8)

The other four types all agree with statement No. 11, and Type IV agrees strongly. Type III also disagrees with statement No. 39, but not very strongly (z= -0.6), while the other three types express modest agreement.

Type II (N = 43)

State and national issues account for 35 per cent of the variance in Type II's pattern of response. Statements about political efficacy, ego centrism, and universities are unrelated to Type II's attitudes. The zero-order correlations between z-score pattern and the national and state issues are 0.33 and 0.31, respectively, indicating general agreement with these issue statements. However, there is one issue statement toward which Type II appears indifferent:

> 3. The problem of school busing is an important consideration in deciding my vote for President. (z= -0.1)

Types I and IV strongly disagree with the statement while Types III and V strongly agree with it.

To a greater extent than all others, Type II disagrees with these statements:

> 21. Obedience and respect for authority are the most important virtues children should learn. (z= -1.6)
>
> 51. University students would not be justified in destroying university property in hopes of accomplishing change at the university which they attend. (z= -2.2)

Type III (N = 74)

Type III rejects statements about the universities, political efficacy, and ego centrism. These vectors account for 55 per cent of the variance in Type III's z-score pattern, and all of the zero-order correlations are negative (-0.60, -0.43, -0.43, respectively). There are no statements with which Type III agrees more than do the other types, and with only the following statement does Type III disagreee more than do the others:

> 2. University students would not be justified in kidnapping or "holding hostage" university administrators in order to dramatize need for change at the university which they attend. (z= -1.7)

National and state issues seem not to be systematically related to Type III's attitudes.

Type IV (N = 72)

Type IV rejects statements about political efficacy and ego centrism. These vectors account for 30 per cent of the variance in the z-score pattern. The zero-order correlations for efficacy and ego centrism are -0.40 and -0.30, respectively. There is only one statement that clearly differentiates Type IV from the others. To a greater extent than all others, Type IV agrees with this statement:

51. University students would not be justified in destroying university property in hopes of accomplishing change at the university which they attend. (z=1.6)

Type V (N = 18)

None of the five vectors -- national issues, state issues, political efficacy, ego centrism, universities -- accounts for a statistically significant proportion of variance in the Type V z-score pattern. However, there are six statements that differentiate Type V from the others. To a greater extent than all others, Type V agrees with these statements:

1. The Vietnam War is an important consideration in deciding my vote for President. (z=1.8)

25. University students would not be justified in peaceful picketing of university buildings in hopes of accomplishing change at the university which they attend. (z=0.9)

And, to a greater extent than all others, Type V disagrees with these statements:

28. In spite of what you read about the wild sex life in important places, the real story is about the same in any group of people. (z= -1.4)

33. The problem of polluting is an important consideration in deciding my vote for President. (z= -1.4)

37. Poverty and welfare problems are important considerations in deciding my vote for President. (z= -0.7)

50. The high cost of living is an important consideration in deciding my vote for President. (z= -1.1)

On balance, it appears that those issues which we defined as national and state election issues -- poverty and welfare, war, taxes, school busing, corruption in government, cost of living, crime -- are not systematically related in the attitudes of the majority of our respondents. Only one type, Type II, clearly demonstrated a pattern of agreement with these statements, and one of the five Types systematically rejected statements about any of the seven issues.

Discriminant Analyses

Each of the discriminant analyses produced at least one significant function; the fifth model, perceived usefulness of communication sources for seeking information, produced two significant functions. The first function of the first model, amount of information received, was significant, accounting for 72.5 per cent of the relative variance and 49.3 per cent of the total variance. The classification analysis correctly classified 47.4 per cent of Type I respondents, 84 per cent of Type II, 38.5 per cent of Type III, 50.0 per cent of Type IV, and 66.7 per cent of Type V.

The second model, kind of campaign information received, produced one significant function. This function accounted for 67.9 per cent of the relative variance and 40.6 per cent of the total variance. The classification analysis correctly classified 52.6 per cent of the Type I respondents, 76.0 per cent of Type II, 33.3 per cent of Type III, 36.8 per cent of Type IV, and 50 per cent of Type V.

The third discriminant model, believability of communication sources, also generated one significant function, which accounted for 70.9 per cent of the relative variance, and 38.6 per cent of the total variance. Of the Type I respondents, 52.6 per cent were correctly classified as were 75.0 per cent of Type II, 27 per cent of Type III, 28.9 per cent of Type IV, and 50 per cent of Type V.

The fourth model, perceived influence of communication sources, produced one significant function which accounted for 73.0 per cent of the relative variance and 52.3 per cent of the total variance. The classification analysis correctly classified 44.4 per cent of Type I respondents, 82.6 per cent of Type II, 42.1 per cent of Type III, 45.7 per cent of Type IV, and 80 per cent of the Type V respondents.

The final discriminant analysis, information seeking from communication sources, produced two significant functions accounting for 61.8 per cent and 19.2 per cent of the relative variance and 47.9 per cent and 22.3 per cent of the total variance, respectively. The classification procedure correctly classified 55.6 per cent of Type I, 84.0 per cent of Type II, 38.5 per cent of Type III, 59.5 per cent of Type IV, and 80.0 per cent of Type V.

The first function of the first model, amount of information received,

---

Table 3 About Here

---

discriminates Type II respondents from all other types, particularly Types III, IV, and V. Variables with positive coefficients (in descending order of magnitude) include: newspapers, vote for U.S. Senator, political mailings, and political party identification. Variables with negative coefficients (in descending order of magnitude) are magazines, vote for President, vote for same political party (over time), worked for a political candidate, vote for State Senator, vote for U.S. Congressman, and other people. The Type II respondents have significantly higher mean scores on magazines (they are a source of information), vote for President (vote Democrat), vote for State Senator (vote Democrat), vote for same political party every election (no), and worked for a political candidate or party (yes). Type V respondents have a higher mean score on party identification (Republican).

The first function of the second model, the kind of campaign information

---

Table 4 About Here

---

received, primarily discriminates between Type II respondents and Types III and V. The following variables (in descending order of magnitude) have positive coefficients on the function: vote for U.S. Senator and information on candidates' personal lives. Variables with negative coefficients (in descending order of magnitude) include: vote for President, vote for same political party, worked for a political candidate or party, vote for State Senator, have attended a political rally or meeting, party identification, candidates' political background, and have belonged to a political club or organization. Neither of the two communication variables entering into the function produced a significant univariate mean difference among types.

Type II respondents have highest mean scores on vote for President (vote Democrat), vote for State Senator (vote Democrat), vote for same political party over time (no), have attended a political meeting or rally (yes), and have worked for a political party or candidate (yes). Type V respondents have the highest mean score on political party identification (Republican).

The third model, source believability, discriminates between Type II and Types III and V.

Table 5 About Here

Only the variable "vote for U.S. Senator" has a positive coefficient on the function. The single communication variable entering into the stepwise model, magazines, has a negative coefficient. The remaining variables with negative coefficients (in descending order of magnitude) include: vote for President, have voted for same political party, vote for State Senator, political party identification, and have attended a political meeting or rally. There is no significant difference among the groups on the communication variable, magazines. Type II respondents have significantly higher mean scores on vote for President (vote Democrat), vote for State Senator (vote Democrat), have voted for same political party (no), have attended a political meeting or rally (yes), and have worked for a political party or candidate (yes).

The significant function of the fourth model, perceived influence of

---

Table 6 About Here

---

communication sources, primarily discriminates Type II respondents from Types III, IV, and V. Vote for U.S. Senator, relatives, television news, and spouse have positive coefficients (in descending order of magnitude) on the funtion. Variables with negative coefficients (in descending order of magnitude) are: vote for President, magazines, have worked for a political candidate or party, vote for State Senator, have voted for the same party, have attended a political meeting or rally, campaign literature, and candidates. Influence of news magazines shows a significant univariate difference among the types; Type II respondents having the highest mean score (perceives magazines have an influence). Type II respondents also have higher mean scores on vote for President (vote Democrat), vote for State Senator (vote

Democrat), vote for same party (no), and have attended a political meeting or rally (yes).

The fifth model, information seeking from communication sources, generated two significant functions. The first function discrimin-

---

Table 7 About Here

---

ates between Type II and Types III, IV, and V. The variables with positive coefficients (in descending order of magnitude) are radio news, public officials, vote for U.S. Senator, and relatives. Variables with negative coefficients on the first function (in descending order of magnitude) are vote for President, have worked for a political party or candidate, have voted for the same political party, vote for U.S. Congressman, news magazines, friends, vote for State Senator, television news, political party identification, and strength of political party affiliation.

The second function of the fifth model primarily discriminates between Type IV respondents and Type I and Type III. Variables with positive coefficients (in descending order of magnitude) include political party identification, television news, vote for State Senator, always vote for the same political party, and relatives. Negative coefficients (in descending order of magnitude) were found on the variables news magazines, strength of political party identification, friends, have worked for a political party or candidate, radio news, public officials, vote for President, and vote for U.S. Congressman.

The only communication variable with a significant mean difference among types is seeking information from public officials. Type V has the highest mean score while Type II has the lowest and sees public officials as not very useful for seeking political information. Type II respondents have the highest mean scores on vote for President (vote Democrat), have worked for a political party or candidate (yes), and have always voted for the same party (no). Type IV respondents have the highest mean score on the party identification variable (Republican).

Discussion

The primary objectives of this study were to (1) isolate attitudinal patterns among a sample of voters, (2) determine if characteristics of the statements used were systematically related to acceptance or rejection of the statements, and (3) test the ability of other communication and political variables to discriminate among the attitude types.

The findings indicate that, except for Type V, characteristics of the statements -- national issues, state issues, political efficacy, ego centrism, universities -- were systematically related to acceptance or rejection of the statements. Further, the multiple discriminant analyses differentiated among the types based on the communication and political variables. The clearest instance of the relationships between the opinion and the communication and political variables was for Type II. These respondents systematically agreed with the statements about national and state election issues. In the discriminant analyses, five of the six significant functions discriminated Type II from the other types. The Type II person tends to be a Democrat and planned to vote for Democratic candidates for State Senator and President. Type II was also more likely to have worked for a political party or candidate, to have attended a political meeting or rally, and was less likely than other types to have consistently voted for the same party over time. Further, the classification analysis correctly classified 80.3 per cent of the Type II respondents.

Only Type II's attitudes showed systematic relationships to the election issues. Types I, III, and IV systematically rejected statements about political efficacy, ego centrism, and universities and university students, but those issues traditionally classified as campaign issues -- welfare, war, taxes, crime, cost of living -- were not systematically related to the ways in which Types I, III, IV, and V responded to the statements. The classification analysis correctly classified 65 per cent of the Type V voters, the second highest classification, but none of the statement dimensions were systematically related to Type V's attitude pattern. All Type V respondents were Republicans, but there was no other variable that differentiated Type V from the other types.

The data suggests that a minority of voters, in this case 19 per cent of the sample, are "issue voters" in the traditional sense, and exhibit other political behaviors, such as attending political meetings and working for candidates that differentiates them from the majority of voters. On the other hand, the data suggests that "traditional issues" are not really issues for the majority of voters. These individuals respond to those

elements in the political system that fall outside the scope of traditional analysis; elements that are in need of identification.

Notes

1. With the exception of political party identification, strength of party identification, and voted for same political party (where the values are as follows: 1 = always voted for the same party; 2 = voted differently; 3 = can't remember; 5 = never voted before), all political activity variables were assigned values of 1 = yes, have participated in the particular activity, and 0 = no, have not participated in the particular activity.

2. All Republican candidates were assigned a value of 1, Democratic candidates a value of 2, and 3 for "other" candidates.

References

Atwood, L. E. Analysis of Q-Factors and Typal Response Patterns. A paper presented at the XIX International Symposium at the International Center for Higher Education in Journalism, Strasbourg, France, November 1970.

Atwood, L.E. and Sanders, K. R. Perception of Information Sources and Likelihood of Split Ticket Voting. Journalism Quarterly, 1975, 52, 421-428.

Becker, J. D. and Preston, I. L. Media Usage and Political Activity. Journalism Quarterly, 1969, 46, 129-134.

Berelson, B., Lazarsfeld, P. F., and McPhee, W. N. Voting: A Study of Opinion Formation in a Presidential Campaign. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1954.

Dustin, D. S. Attitudes Toward Political Candidates. Psychological Reports, 1965, 16, 1212.

Jahoda, G. Political Attitudes and Judgments of Other People. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1954, 49, 330-334.

Kerpelman, L. C. Personality and Attitude Correlates of Political Candidate Preference. The Journal of Social Psychology, 1968, 219-226.

Klapper, J. T. The Effects of Mass Communication. Glencoe, Ill: Free Press, 1960.

Klecka, W. R. Discriminant Analysis. In N. Nie, C. H. Hull, J. G. Jenks, K. Steinbrenner, and D. H. Bent (eds.) Statistical Package for the Social Sciences. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1975.

Lazarsfeld, P. F., Berelson, B. and Gaudet, H. The People's Choice. New York: Columbia University Press, 1948.

McCombs, M. The Influence of Mass Communication in Politics. Today's Speech, 1968, 16, 31-34.

MacLean, M. S. Jr., Danbury, T. and McNelly, J. T. Your Response to the Journalism Issues Survey. Association for Education in Journalism, Austin, Texas, August 1964; see also AEJ Members and Their Attitudes on Journalism Education Issues, Journalism Quarterly, 1965, 42, 98-107.

Nimmo, D. and Savage, R. L. Candidates and Their Images. Pacific Palisades, California: Goodyear Publishing Company, Inc. 1976.

Sherrod, D. R. Selective Perception of Political Candidates. Public Opinion Quarterly, 1972, 35,554-562.

Table I
Q-Analysis Typal Z-Scores

Item Description	Typal Zs I	II	III	IV	V
1. The Vietnam War is an important consideration in deciding my vote for President.	0.8	0.7	0.3	0.8	1.8
2. University students would not be justified in kidnapping or "holding hostage" university administrators in order to dramatize need for change at the university which they attend.	0.2	-0.0	-1.7	1.3	1.1
3. The problem of school bussing is an important consideration in deciding my vote for President.	-1.5	-0.1	1.1	-1.1	1.8
4. The high cost of living is an important consideration in deciding my vote for Governor.	0.6	0.4	0.4	0.3	0.1
5. I'm the kind of person who other people push around a great deal.	-2.4	-2.2	-2.1	-1.9	-1.1
6. The problem of school bussing is an important consideration in deciding my vote for State Senator.	-1.9	-0.2	0.5	-0.5	-0.4
7. Nowadays when so many different kinds of people move around and mix together so much, a person has to protect himself especially carefully against catching an infection or disease from them.	0.3	-1.0	-0.6	-0.8	0.6
8. The high cost of living is an important consideration in deciding my vote for State Senator.	0.1	0.2	0.6	1.0	0.1
9. The drug abuse problem is an important consideration in deciding my vote for Governor.	0.0	-0.5	0.7	0.3	0.4
10. Insults to our honor are not always important enough to bother about.	0.0	0.7	-1.3	-0.8	-2.1
11. Taxes are an important issue in deciding my vote for State Senator.	-0.6	0.4	0.6	1.0	0.4
12. When a person has a problem or worry it is best for him not to think about it, but to keep busy with more cheeful things.	0.1	-2.1	-1.2	-1.8	0.1
13. Poverty and welfare problems are important considerations in deciding my vote for Governor.	0.7	1.0	0.9	0.6	0.1
14. Human nature being what it is, there will always be war and conflict.	0.8	-0.2	0.9	-0.4	1.6

Table I
(Continued)

Item Description	Typal Zs I	II	III	IV	V
15. Crime and lawlessness in society are important considerations in deciding my vote for State Senator.	0.6	-0.3	0.6	0.7	-0.4
16. The future course of our relations with Russia and China is an important consideration in deciding my vote for President.	0.2	1.5	0.2	1.0	1.8
17. Every person should have complete faith in some supernatural power whose decisions he obeys without question.	0.3	-1.5	0.5	-2.1	1.1
18. Taxes are an important issue in deciding my vote for Governor.	0.4	0.4	0.5	1.4	1.6
19. I usually feel pretty sure my life will work out the way I want it to.	0.8	0.6	0.2	-0.5	0.6
20. The problem of pollution is an important consideration in deciding my vote for Governor.	1.5	1.0	0.0	-0.1	-0.6
21. Obedience and respect for authority are the most important virtues children should learn.	0.6	-1.6	0.5	0.3	0.1
22. The problem of pollution is an important consideration in deciding my vote for State Senator.	0.7	0.4	-0.2	0.0	-0.6
23. I'm the kind of person who lives from day to day rather than planning my life ahead all the time.	2.1	-1.6	-0.5	-0.5	-0.7
24. The problem of school bussing is an important consideration in deciding my vote for Governor.	-0.9	-0.4	0.9	-0.8	0.1
25. University students would not be justified in peaceful picketing of accomplishing change at the university which they attend.	-0.5	-0.6	-1.6	-1.2	0.9
26. Crime and lawlwssness in society are important considerations in deciding my vote for Governor.	-0.3	-0.3	0.7	0.1	0.4
27. Corruption in government is an important consideration in deciding my vote for State Senator.	1.4	1.0	0.2	0.3	0.4
28. In spite of what you read about the wild sex life in important places, the real story is about the same in any group of people.	0.5	0.4	-0.0	0.3	-1.4
29. The drug abuse problem is an important consideration in deciding my vote for President.	0.1	0.3	0.7	1.0	1.1

Table I
(Continued)

Item Description	Typal Zs I	II	III	IV	V
30. I am the kind of person who has mostly bad luck.	-2.7	-1.4	-2.1	-2.5	-1.4
31. Poverty and welfare problems are important considerations in deciding my vote for State Senator.	0.6	0.7	1.2	0.4	0.8
32. If it weren't for the rebellious ideas of youth there would be less progress in the world.	-0.8	-0.1	-2.0	-1.5	-0.4
33. The problem of pollution is an important consideration in deciding my vote for President.	1.3	0.8	0.5	-0.2	-1.4
34. The artist and professor are probably more important to society than the businessman or manufacturer.	-0.2	-0.5	-1.1	-1.5	-1.1
35. The problem of school finances is an important consideration in deciding my vote for State Senator.	-0.1	0.7	0.8	-0.4	-1.4
36. University students would be justified in staging non-violent "sit-ins" in hopes of accomplishing change at the university which they attend.	-0.5	1.1	-1.8	-0.7	-2.1
37. Poverty and welfare problems are important considerations in deciding my vote for President.	0.3	1.2	1.1	0.8	-0.7
38. Governmental corruption is an important consideration in deciding my vote for Governor.	0.6	1.3	1.0	0.2	0.4
39. University students would be justified in holding peaceful protest rallies in order to bring about change at the university which they attend.	-1.8	0.7	-0.6	0.8	0.1
40. The problem of school finances is an important consideration in deciding my vote for President.	-0.6	0.9	0.9	-0.7	-1.4
41. The state income tax is an important consideration in deciding my vote for State Senator.	-0.1	0.4	0.5	0.9	0.1
42. Taxes are an important issue in deciding my vote for President.	0.7	0.2	0.5	1.0	0.4
43. University students would be justified in seizing buildings on campus in order to dramatize need for change at the university which they attend.	-1.8	-2.0	-2.8	-1.5	-1.9

Table I
(Continued)

Item Description	Typal Zs I	II	III	IV	V
44. Corruption in government is an important consideration in deciding my vote for President.	0.3	0.9	0.5	0.5	1.1
45. Once I start things, I nearly always finish them.	-0.5	-0.1	-0.1	0.7	0.1
46. The drug abuse problem is an important consideration in deciding my vote for State Senator.	0.4	0.6	0.5	1.0	1.1
47. University students would not be justified in staging a student strike in order to bring about change at the university which they attend.	-1.7	-2.1	-0.5	0.5	0.4
48. The state income tax is an important consideration in deciding my vote for Governor.	1.0	0.5	-0.3	1.4	0.1
49. The findings of science may some-day show that many of our most cherished beliefs are wrong.	-1.0	0.3	-1.2	-0.1	-0.7
50. The high cost of living is an important consideration in deciding my vote for President.	1.0	1.2	1.0	1.0	-1.1
51. University students would not be justified in destroying university property in hopes of accomplishing change at the university which they attend.	-0.8	-2.2	0.4	1.6	0.4
52. The problem of school finances is an important consideration in deciding my vote for Governor.	0.3	1.0	0.8	-0.7	-0.6
53. Crime and lawlessness in society are important considerations in deciding my vote for President.	1.3	-0.5	0.9	0.8	0.4

Table 2

Correlations Between Q-Types

	Type I	Type II	Type III	Type IV	Type V
Type I	------	0.396	0.455	0.397	0.188
Type II		-----	0.422	0.422	0.024
Type III			-----	0.509	0.401
Type IV				-----	0.377
Type V					-----

Table 3

Summary of Discriminant Analysis for Amount of Information Received From Source [1]

a.

Function	Relative Variance	Lambda	Chi Square	df	pLT
First	72.54	.3588	119.926	52	0.00

b.

Group Centroids

Group	Function 1st
Type I	0.05271
Type II	-1.38308
Type III	0.47846
Type IV	0.30213
Type V	0.56824

Table 3
(Cont.)

Variable	c. Discriminant Function Coefficients Function 1st	d. Group Means Type I	Type II	Type III	Type IV	Type V
Info. from people	-0.19295	2.89	3.32	2.97	3.08	2.67
Info. from newspapers	0.38016	3.79	3.60	3.95	3.71	4.33
Info. from magazines	-0.51892	2.68	3.64	2.97	2.45	2.83*
Info. from political mailings	0.22179	1.79	1.96	2.23	1.79	2.17
Info. from radio	0.09554	2.32	2.40	2.74	2.42	1.67
Info. from candidates	-0.03627	2.89	3.08	3.03	2.66	3.83
Vote for President	-0.48978	1.84	1.96	1.51	1.55	1.67***
Vote for U.S. Senator	0.34430	1.53	1.28	1.51	1.39	1.17
Vote for U.S. Congress	-0.18107	2.05	2.28	2.08	2.11	2.17
Vote for State Senator	-0.22724	1.63	1.96	1.64	1.71	1.50*
Party Identification	0.02392	1.37	1.96	1.54	1.97	2.00*
Have voted for same political party	-0.29911	1.84	3.12	1.56	2.21	2.67***
Worked for political candidate or party	-0.39025	0.37	0.56	0.31	0.16	0.17*

*Significant univariate F-ratios, $p < .05$, df=4,122
***Significant univariate F-ratios, $p < .001$, df=4,122

[1]Generally, how much information do you think you have received about the candidates and the issues from these sources of information? People, newspapers, news reporters, news magazines, radio news, television news, political mailings, phone campaign messages, paid political ads, editorials, candidates (a lot, quite a bit, hard to say, not very much, not at all).

Table 4

Summary of Discriminant Analysis for Kind of Campaign Information Received[1]

a.

Function	Relative Variance	Lambda	Chi Square	df	pLT
First	67.86	.4375	97.961	40	0.00

b.

Group Centroids

Group	Function 1st
Type I	0.11454
Type II	-1.25511
Type III	0.47240
Type IV	0.21678
Type V	0.42323

Table 4
(Cont.)

Variable	c. Discriminant Function Coefficients	d. Group Means				
	Function 1st	Type I	Type II	Type III	Type IV	Type V
Info. about Candidates' personal lives	0.17782	2.89	2.40	3.15	2.76	3.17
Info. about Candidates' political background	-0.13369	3.42	3.84	3.77	3.68	3.00
Vote for President	-0.48352	1.84	1.96	1.51	1.55	1.17***
Vote for U.S. Senator	0.30927	1.53	1.28	1.51	1.39	1.17
Vote for State Senator	-0.34269	1.63	1.96	1.64	1.71	1.50*
Party Identification	-0.15005	1.37	1.96	1.54	1.97	2.00*
Have voted for same political party	-0.40188	1.84	3.12	1.56	2.21	2.67***
Have attended political meeting	-0.16188	.47	.80	.51	.29	.50**
Worked for political candidate or party	-0.39025	.37	.56	.31	.16	.17*
Belong to political club or organization	-0.11766	.11	.16	.08	.00	.17

*Significant univariate F-ratios, $p < .05$, df=4,122
**Significant univariate F-ratios, $p < .01$, df=4,122
***Significant univariate F-ratios, $p < .001$, df=4,122

[1]Generally, how much information do you think you have received about the candidates' personal lives, the campaign issues, the candidates' personal character, and the candidates' political background (a lot, quite a bit, hard to say, not very much, not at all)?

Table 5

Summary of Discriminant Analysis for Source Believability[1]

a.

Function	Relative Variance	Lambda	Chi Square	df	pLT
First	70.92	.4819	85.041	32	0.00

b.

Group Centroids

Group	Function 1st
Type I	0.11905
Type II	-1.23795
Type III	0.46515
Type IV	0.21802
Type V	0.32553

Table 5
(Cont.)

Variable	c. Discriminant Function Coefficients	d. Group Means				
	Function 1st	Type I	Type II	Type III	Type IV	Type V
Believability of magazines	-0.22219	2.95	3.63	2.97	3.21	3.50
Vote for President	-0.52587	1.84	1.96	1.54	1.55	1.17**
Vote for U.S. Senator	0.29909	1.53	1 29	1.51	1.39	1.17
Vote for State Senator	-0.32704	1.63	1.96	1.65	1.71	1.50*
Party Identification	-0.12064	1.37	1.92	1.54	1.97	2.00
Have voted for same political party	-0.46069	1.84	3.17	1.57	2.21	2.67***
Have attended political meeting	-0.10571	.47	.79	.54	.29	.50**
Worked for political candidate or party	-0.41408	.37	.54	.32	.16	.17*

*Significant univariate F-ratios, $p < .05$, df=4,119
**Significant univariate F-ratios, $p < .01$, df=4,119
***Significant univariate F-ratios, $p < .001$, df=4,119

[1] Tell me how believable the information you are getting is from each of these sources: people, television, newspapers, magazines, political mail, radio, telephone campaign messages (very beleivable, somewhat believable, hard to say, slightly believable, not at all believable).

Table 6

Summary of Discriminant Analysis for Influence of Sources[1]

a.

Function	Relative Variance	Lambda	Chi Square	df	pLT
First	72.97	.3272	121.759	52	0.00

b.

Group Centroids

Group	Function 1st
Type I	-0.08856
Type II	-1.41766
Type III	0.37599
Type IV	0.51494
Type V	0.37777

Table 6
(Cont.)

Variable	c. Discriminant Function Coefficients: Function 1st	d. Group Means: Type I	Type II	Type III	Type IV	Type V
Influence of friends	-0.12709	2.44	2.78	2.34	2.23	1.80
Influence of relatives	0.12274	1.94	1.65	1.87	2.11	1.40
Influence of news magazines	-0.46770	2.61	3.61	2.50	2.20	3.00***
Influence of television news	0.03004	3.72	4.09	3.53	3.91	4.00
Influence of campaign literature	-0.08347	1.94	2.00	1.82	1.60	2.40
Influence of candidates	-0.06633	3.22	3.87	3.13	3.31	2.80
Influence of spouse	0.02774	1.72	2.57	2.34	2.46	1.60
Vote for President	-0.53969	1.83	1.96	1.50	1.51	1.20**
Vote for U.S. Senator	0.33680	1.56	1.30	1.53	1.40	1.20
Vote for State Senator	-0.25453	1.67	1.96	1.63	1.69	1.40*
Have voted for same political party	-0.19331	1.83	2.96	1.50	2.17	2.20***
Have attended political meeting	-0.18256	.50	.87	.50	.26	.40***
Worked for political candidate or party	-0.29765	.39	.61	.34	.17	.20

*Significant univariate F-ratios, $p < .05$, df=4,114
**Significant univariate F-ratios, $p < .01$, df=4,114
***Significant univariate F-ratios, $p < .001$, df=4,114

[1]Generally, how much do you think your opinions about the candidates and the issues have been influenced this year by each of these sources of information: friends, relatives, newspapers, news magazines, radio news, television news, campaign workers, political campaign literature, candidates, television campaign advertising, radio campaign advertising, public officials, spouse (a lot, quite a bit, hard to say, not very much, not at all)?

Table 7

Summary of Discriminant Analysis for Information Seeking[1]

a.

Function	Relative Variance	Lambda	Chi Square	df	pLT
First	61.78	.3115	132.365	56	0.000
Second	19.21	.5984	58.278	39	0.024

b.

Group Centroids

Group	Function 1st	2nd
Type I	0.11386	-0.43680
Type II	-1.35396	-0.01024
Type III	0.43548	-0.40993
Type IV	0.32286	0.68089
Type V	0.57442	-0.21743

Table 7
(Cont.)

Variable	c. Discriminant Function Coefficients: Function 1st	Function 2nd	d. Group Means: Type I	Type II	Type III	Type IV	Type V
Info. from friends	-0.23324	-0.36523	3.06	2.92	2.77	2.46	3.60
Indo. from relatives	0.09088	0.04571	2.94	2.00	2.51	2.46	2.80
Info. from radio news	0.29341	-0.17192	3.50	2.76	3.18	3.03	3.80
Info. from news magazines	-0.26044	-0.49748	3.06	3.56	3.13	2.68	3.80
Info. from television news	-0.09911	0.46064	4.00	3.88	3.64	4.03	4.60
Info. from public officials	0.29032	-0.11647	2.72	2.12	2.74	2.49	4.20*
Vote for President	-0.42937	-0.08290	1.83	1.96	1.51	1.54	1.00***
Vote for U.S. Senator	0.24308	0.14518	1.56	1.28	1.51	1.38	1.00
Vote for U.S. Congress	-0.26889	-0.06498	2.06	2.28	2.08	2.08	2.20
Vote for State Senator	-0.21350	0.22222	1.67	1.96	1.64	1.70	1.60
Party identification	-0.01890	0.59742	1.39	1.96	1.54	2.00	1.80*
Strength of party identification	-0.04899	-0.38985	5.28	5.04	5.36	4.57	5.00
Have voted for same political party	-0.34057	0.15674	1.83	3.12	1.56	2.14	2.80***
Worked for political candidate or party	-0.41414	-0.23768	.39	.56	.31	.16	.00**

*Significant univariate F-ratios, $p \leq .05$, df=4,119
**Significant univariate F-ratios, $p \leq .01$, df=4,119
***Significant univariate F-ratios, $p \leq .001$, df=4,119

[1]If you were to vote tomorrow and wanted some more information about the candidates and issues, how helpful do you think each of these sources of information would be: friends, relatives, newspapers, radio news, news magazines, television news, political campaign literature, public officials, campaign workers (very helpful, some help, hard to say, not very helpful, not at all helpful)?